DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 943 HE 023 000

TITLE	Legislative Priorities for the Commission, 1989. Commission Report 89-1.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Jan 89
NOTE	16p.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth St., Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Educational Economics; Educational Finance; Educational Technology; Equal Education; Expenditures; Fees; *Government Role; Grants; *Postsecondary Education; *Public Policy; *State Government; *State Legislation; Student Costs; Student Financial Aid; Technological Advancement
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The seven highest priorities of the California Postsecondary Education Commission for state legislative initiatives during the first half of the 1988-89 legislative session are described. They include: (1) improving state oversight of private postsecondary education; (2) meeting California's adult education needs; (3) promoting educational equity; (4) ensuring equitable and predictable student fees; (5) responding to new instructional technologies; (6) developing state policy for adjusting maximum student financial aid awards in the Cal Grant programs; and (7) revising the "Gann limit" placed by voters on growth in appropriations of tax revenues for all governmental entities in the state. For each of the priorities, the issue, its context and conditions, and a specific recommendation for Commission action are outlined. Contains 5 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA Postsecondary

Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Summary

The Commission has agreed on the following seven priorities for initiative with the Legislature during the first year of the 1989-90 legislative session:

		Page
1.	Improving State oversight of private postsecondary education	1
2.	Meeting California's adult education needs	2
3.	Promoting educational equity	3
4.	Ensuring equitable and predictable student fees	4
5.	Responding to the new instructional technologies	5
6.	Developing State policy for adjusting maximum Cal Grant awards	6
7.	Revising the "Gann Limit" on State spending	6

The priorities are based on existing Commission policy, and the recommended actions involve working with the Legislature either to amend existing legislation or to initiate new legislative proposals.

The Commission adopted this report at its meeting on January 23, 1989, on recommendation of its Administration and Liaison Committee. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Library of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Bruce Hamlett of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8010.

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR THE COMMISSION, 1989

A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 89-1
PUBLISHED JANUARY 1989

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 89-1 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

1.	Improving State Oversight of Private Postsecondary Education	1
2.	Meeting California's Adult Education Needs	2
3.	Promoting Educational Equity	3
4.	Ensuring Equitable and Predictable Student Fees	4
5.	Responding to New Instructional Technologies	5
6.	Developing State Policy for Adjusting Maximum Cal Grant Awards	6
7.	Revising the "Gann Limit" on Spending	6
	References	7

Legislative Priorities for the Commission, 1989

BASED on its current policies and recommendations, the California Postsecondary Education Commission is planning a number of legislative initiatives during the first half of the 1988-89 legislative session. Among its highest priorities are the following seven:

1. Improving State oversight of private postsecondary education

The issue: The non-public sector of postsecondary education in California, with more than 350 degree-granting colleges and universities and 1,800 non-degree granting vocational institutions, is by far the largest of any state in the country. It is second to only the California Community Colleges in the number of students it enrolls annually. Despite its size, however, relatively limited State resources are devoted to the task of maintaining and promoting its quality.

Statutory changes have been made almost annually in the oversight provisions for private postsecondary education during the past decade, producing an extremely complex set of provisions and procedures for the licensure of private institutions seeking to award degrees or diplomas. Yet while the minimum standards for private non-accredited institutions have definitely been strengthened, California continues to have a reputation as a haven for private institutions that award easy degrees.

The Commission is directed by legislation enacted in 1984 to review and evaluate the effectiveness of existing law and the implementation of this law by the State Department of Education in "protecting the integrity of degrees and diplomas issued by private postsecondary educational institutions." A draft of this review and evaluation will be discussed by the Commission in May 1989.

The Commission has also been directed by the Legislature to (1) review the operations of accrediting associations that operate in California and accredit private postsecondary institutions, and (2) present recommendations about whether the State should assume any or all of the responsibilities currently delegated to these non-governmental associations. This report will be discussed by the Commission in February 1989.

The entire Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977, as amended, is scheduled to become inoperative on June 30, 1991, and repealed on January 1, 1992. The Commission's two reports will provide the foundation for legislation to either retain or revise the existing oversight provisions for private institutions operating in California.

Concerning the State's role in promoting quality in private postsecondary education, the Commission concluded in its 1984 report, *Public Policy, Accreditation, and State Approval*, that the State

> should maintain a strong, rigorous process for the qualitative review of educational institutions. This State process should be sufficiently thorough as to assure the public in general, as well as other state agencies, that state recognition does identify institutions with educational programs that meet minimum quality standards. These responsibilities for quality review should not be delegated by the State to non-governmental accrediting agencies. Accreditation provides an additional set of standards and a peer review process that institutions can voluntarily choose in developing levels of academic quality that are above and beyond the State's basic responsibilities for the licensure of postsecondary institutions. The maintenance of a strong state review process neither lessens the critical importance of accreditation nor moves the State into the role of an accreditation agency. Moreover, it does not imply that accreditation and State approval are equivalent (p. 1).

Several basic principles for State policy in the licensure of independent and private institutions are inherent in that Commission policy:

1. *Compliance with minimum standards of educational quality:* All institutions licensed by the State should be expected to comply with minimum standards of educational quality, with clearly defined educational objectives appropriate to postsecondary education and adequate learning resources to assist in the achievement of these objectives.

2. *Compliance with minimum consumer protection standards:* All institutions licensed by the State should be expected to comply with minimum standards of consumer protection, such as an honest and accurate catalog or other publication available to students and the public, stating the institution's purposes and objectives, entrance requirements and procedures, full- and part-time faculty and degrees held, and the costs of attendance.

3. *Integrity of degrees:* The nomenclature of degrees awarded should clearly indicate the nature of the work taken and the competencies that possession of the degree implies, with graduate degrees restricted to the appropriate level of competency beyond the baccalaureate level.

4. *Opportunity for institutional creativity:* While the State's licensure process should be thorough and rigorous, it should also not inhibit innovative and creative institutions which comply with the State's minimum standards.

5. *Review of the entire institution:* Off-campus, out-of-state and other special programs awarding academic credit are integral parts of the institution, and the State's licensure process should review all operations by the institution and expect that the institution maintain direct quality and fiscal controls of all aspects of all programs and provide adequate resources to maintain this quality.

6. *Clarity in the State's licensure process:* The licensure process utilized by the State should be understandable by the educational consumer and simplify rather than complicate student choice among institutions.

7. *Institutional due process:* The licensure process should allow institutions that receive adverse decisions the full opportunity for due process and administrative hearings, with specific statements provided of the reasons for denial.

8. *Support for voluntary non-governmental accreditation:* Accreditation is the process of ongoing peer and professional review of institutional operations that institutions may utilize as a means of improving their effectiveness and quality, and it has an historical record of promoting quality in private postsecondary education. These important functions should be protected and preserved, and accreditation should be maintained as a non-governmental and voluntary process.

9. *Distinction between licensure and accreditation:* State licensure and non-governmental accreditation are two different processes designed to accomplish different objectives. Historically, California has maintained a positive and constructive relationship between licensure and accreditation, and this relationship should be maintained.

During the past decade, the Commission has been actively involved in the effort to strengthen California's licensure process for private postsecondary education. The primary objectives of its effort has been to promote the effective integration of private postsecondary institutions into California's postsecondary education system; provide an appropriate oversight agency that is responsive to the needs of both the producers and consumers of private education; foster and improve the educational programs and services of private institutions while protecting the citizens of California from fraudulent or substandard operations.

Recommendation: Commission staff should take a leadership role in promoting legislation to strengthen State oversight of private postsecondary education, based upon the principles presented above and the recommendations to be adopted by the Commission during the next few months in its review of the existing law and the implementation of this law by the State Department of Education.

---

2. Meeting California's adult education needs

The issue: Supplemental Language to the 1987 Budget Act directed the Commission to review the adequacy of California's existing adult education system

to meet current and future priorities. In responding to this directive, the Commission published *Meeting California's Adult Education Needs* in October 1988, in which it presented the following conclusions:

- California lags behind the rest of the nation in providing adult education to its citizens, and yet by any demographic indicator its population has equal, if not greater, need for literacy, vocational education, and other programs provided by adult and non-credit education. At this time, access is limited by growth limitations and funded below current service levels in much of the State.
- Some regions of the State are not served by any adult or non-credit education provider since only those districts with programs in existence before 1978 are authorized to offer courses -- even if local growth and circumstances warrant such activity. Eighteen school districts that lacked adult education programs in 1978 have requested authority to begin such programs, but legislative attempts to address the problem have failed. These districts are located in 14 counties, most of them small, rural, and with limited alternative education providers to offset the lack of adult education opportunities.
- Community colleges are constrained from entering more widely into the adult and non-credit education arena by the statutory stipulation that adult education courses are the primary responsibility of the adult schools. Except for courses offered at the thirteenth and fourteenth grade levels, community college governing boards must negotiate "delineation of function" agreements with local school district boards in order to provide State-subsidized courses for adults not seeking a degree or certificate.
- Eligible legalized aliens under the provisions of the federal Immigration Reform and Control Act have an urgent need for English instruction, which requires immediate action by the Governor and Legislature. Approximately 800,000 to one million eligible legalized aliens in California who are working to become permanent residents have only two and one-half years to show language proficiency and basic citizenship skills in order to avoid deportation. Federal funds to expand classes in citizenship and English as a second language for these purposes are available, but their utilization is restricted because of the State-imposed caps on adult education.

The Commission therefore recommended that:

1. The cap on funds for basic skills should be removed in order to allow classes to expand to meet the current urgent needs;
2. The prohibition against the starting of adult education programs by communities that lacked such programs in 1978 should be removed; and
3. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges should establish a task force to jointly prepare and submit a five-year plan for California adult education.

In response to the urgent need to provide educational services to eligible legalized aliens under the provisions of the Immigration Reform and Control Act, the Commission was directed by the 1988 Budget Act to assess the adequacy of the educational programs and present recommendations for future educational funding. The Commission has contracted with California Tomorrow to complete its project. A preliminary report will be submitted to the Legislature prior to January 1, 1989, with a final report to be transmitted prior to March 15, 1989.

Recommendation: Commission staff should seek legislative action to implement the Commission's proposals to permit funding for English as a Second Language (ESL) and Basic Skills to be provided on an on-demand basis and to remove the prohibition against the offering of adult education by communities that now cannot do so. In addition, the Commission staff will seek immediate legislative action to implement recommendations for any needed changes in the administration, provision, and funding of educational programs for eligible legalized aliens under the provisions of IRCA, as proposed by California Tomorrow and endorsed by the Commission.

---

3. Promoting educational equity

The issue: The Commission's 1988-89 workplan assigns a high priority to activities designed to expand

educational opportunities so that *all* Californians are encouraged and assisted to develop their talents and skills to the fullest for their own benefit and that of the State. The workplan activities include the goals of (1) increasing the ethnic and gender diversity of college and university professoriate, (2) enhancing the selection and graduation of American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, low-income and women students in graduate programs; (3) enhancing the preparation of teachers to provide a quality educational experience for the diverse population of school children of the future, and (4) increasing the flow of college students through baccalaureate graduation.

Within the context of these workplan activities, the Commission has been directed by Assembly Bill 610 (Hughes, 1985; codified as *Education Code* Section 8609 and 8616) to assess whether the Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) Program is operating as a cooperative effort of secondary and postsecondary institutions working with private industry to increase the number of low-income and ethnic minority secondary school students who pursue mathematics-based courses of study in college. The Commission is expected to present recommendations for the improvement of MESA's operation in January 1989.

The Commission has also been directed to evaluate pilot MESA projects working at the junior high school level, with this evaluation to be completed prior to September 1, 1989. A previous evaluation of MESA by the Center for the Study Evaluation at UCLA concluded that the program was extremely effective. Existing statute for the entire MESA program will become inoperative June 30, 1990.

Recommendation: Commission staff should seek to implement the Commission's recommendations regarding the operation of MESA and the removal of MESA's sunset date. In addition, Commission staff will support legislative initiatives in the educational equity area which are consistent with the Commission's workplan priorities and policy proposals.

---

4. Ensuring equitable and predictable student fees

The issue: Current State student fee policy was enacted in 1985 through the passage of Senate Bill 195 (Maddy, Chapter 1523, Statutes of 1985) but is scheduled to sunset on August 31, 1990. This policy was developed by an intersegmental Student Fee Policy Committee, chaired by Commission staff. It includes principles stating that (1) fees are to be kept as low as possible; (2) the State shall bear primary responsibility for the cost of providing postsecondary education; (3) students shall be responsible for a portion of the total cost of their education; and (4) any necessary increases in mandatory systemwide student fees shall be gradual, moderate, predictable, and equitably borne by all students in each segment.

The policy specifically provides that (1) student fees shall be fixed at least ten months prior to the fall term in which they become effective; (2) in the event that State revenues and expenditures are substantially unbalanced due to unforeseen factors, annual fee increases or decreases are permitted up to only 10 percent; and (3) mandatory systemwide student fees for graduate students shall not differ from those charged undergraduate students.

At the request of student organizations and the systemwide offices of the segments, Commission staff reconvened the Student Fee Policy Committee to develop legislative proposals to replace or extend the existing policy, and a consensus has been reached on legislation to be introduced in 1989.

The Commission has also been directed by the Legislature, through Senate Concurrent Resolution 69 (Morgan, 1988) to convene a policy committee to develop recommendations for a long-term, non-resident undergraduate and graduate student tuition policy. The committee's recommendations are to be submitted to the Legislature by the Commission prior to July 1, 1989. The development of these recommendations for non-resident tuition may occur parallel with the work of the Student Fee Policy Committee.

Recommendation: Commission staff should take a leadership role in promoting legislation

to implement the consensus recommendations of the Student Fee Policy Committee to extend the existing policy. Commission staff should also work with legislators and the Governor's staff to develop and implement proposals to implement recommendations on non-resident student tuition policy.

---

5. Responding to new instructional technologies

The issue: New instructional technologies ranging from computers and video discs to cable networks and a nationwide satellite relay system provide California excellent opportunities to accomplish important long-range educational objectives efficiently. These opportunities include:

- The development and implementation of major curricular improvements at many public colleges and universities at a relatively reasonable cost -- for example, increasing the availability of foreign language instruction throughout the State by the transmission of existing courses to those campuses that currently do not have the capacity to offer them.
- Meeting the challenges of changing demographics in the student population, including the need for remediation, greater English literacy, and preparedness for postsecondary education.
- Expanded access to higher education for individuals who currently do not participate because of geographical isolation or language barriers.
- Expanded involvement in higher education for individuals with physical or learning disabilities through the use of adaptive technology that, for example, allows students with poor visual processing to hear what has been written.
- Increased offerings of high-demand academic programs, such as computer science and engineering, on more educational sites throughout the State in a relatively cost-effective manner.
- The development and implementation of an expanded and enriched high school curriculum utilizing faculty members of various colleges and universities -- particularly for advanced mathematics, science, and language courses that many high schools do not have the resources to offer.

The Educational Technology Committee, established in 1983 as an advisory body to the State Department of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction on the appropriate uses of the new technologies, is scheduled to sunset on June 30, 1989. It is anticipated that the Legislature will consider several proposals in 1989 to either continue or revise this committee as well as to establish pilot projects to expand the uses of the new technologies in education.

Commission staff is currently engaged in two projects that relate directly to this issue and the anticipated legislative proposals:

- The first will seek to develop proposals to expand the integration of computer-assisted instruction and research into public school, college, and university operations. The primary objective is to integrate the existing and proposed inter-institutional computer networks into a comprehensive statewide network which can be accessed by all educational institutions for teaching and research purposes.
- The second is designed to develop a comprehensive statewide plan to achieve three objectives:
  1. Maximum creative use of the new technologies by all segments of the education community;
  2. Efficient use of financial resources in the acquisition and maintenance of telecommunications equipment; and
  3. Maximum use of the new instructional technologies to accomplish efficiently important long-range educational objectives.

Both projects are scheduled for Commission review prior to July 1989.

Recommendation: Commission staff should work with legislators and the Governor's staff to develop and implement proposals to achieve these objectives and expand the uses of the new technologies to accomplish important educational objectives efficiently and effectively.

---

6. Developing State policy for adjusting maximum Cal Grant awards

The issue: In conjunction with the California Student Aid Commission, the Postsecondary EducationCommission has been directed to convene a policy committee to make recommendations about (1) the role of the State in meeting the educational costs of students with financial need that choose to attend non-public postsecondary educational institutions, and (2) alternative policies for setting maximum grant levels under the Cal Grant A and Cal Grant B student financial aid programs for students attending these institutions. The policy committee's final report is to be submitted jointly by the two commissions to the Legislature and the Governor by February 1, 1989.

The context for this legislative request is a long history of inadequate funding in all areas of student aid, as well as increasing competition between proponents for funding for larger maximum awards for students attending independent institutions with proponents for funding to increase the number of awards for students attending public institutions, particularly community colleges. The recommendations by the policy committee should be presented within a balanced framework, with equal attention to both access (an increase in the total number of awards) and choice (an increase in the maximum award for students choosing to attend non-public institutions).

Recommendation: Commission staff should continue to participate with representatives of the Student Aid Commission and other agencies on the policy committee to reach a consensus on recommendations to establish and adjust the maximum award, and seek legislative action as necessary to implement these recommendations.

---

6. Revising the "Gann Limit" on spending

The issue: In 1979, California's voters approved Proposition 4, which added Article XIIIB to the State Constitution. Basically, that initiative set a limit -- the "Gann Limit" -- on the growth in appropriations of tax revenues for all governmental entities in the State. The State and virtually all local governmental bodies are subject to this limit, but only the State determines the overall limit and how close total appropriations are to it. For the first five years that the Gann Limit was in operation, it had little effect on State expenditures because appropriations were always well below it. However, in recent years it has been a factor in reducing spending by both State and local governments. Fiscal experts from the public and private sectors, including academe and industry, have carefully studied both the concept and operation of the spending limit, and most agree that it has at least three flaws

1. The instruments used to annually adjust the limit for inflation -- the United States Consumer Price Index or the California per-capita personal income, whichever is lower -- tend to understate the need for such increases. The current inflation factor not only limits growth in public spending but actually reduces -- in real terms -- this spending because it requires use of the "lesser" of these two growth measures. Suggestions have been made that a more accurate inflation factor would be one more consistent with real economic growth that is indexed to the average annual change in per-capita personal income and the national Consumer Price Index. By tying changes in the appropriations limit to a more appropriate measure of economic growth, the "ratcheting down" effect produced by the current ratio of State expenditures to personal income would be eliminated.
2. The definitions of population used in calculating the annual appropriations limit also tend to understate the need for its increase. While the limit is adjusted by the State's population growth in general, certain segments of California's population -- among them, school-aged children and people over the age of 60 -- are expanding more rapidly than the population at large. These groups tend to need public services more than the citizenry as a whole, yet the Gann Limit's population factor does not account for their differential growth. Replacing the current population definitions with ones more sensitive to variable rates of growth in different high- and low-cost segments of the population would be a significant improvement to the Gann Limit by making it more

applicable to the actual profile -- and needs -- of the State's populace.

3. The Gann Limit is incomplete in excluding substantial assessments and expenditures by State and local governments that are not defined as "tax proceeds," even though they are used for identical purposes as tax revenues. These areas of spending not contained in Article XIIIB include:

   - Special assessment districts with tax rates lower than 12½ cents per $100 of assessed valuation;
   - Tax-like benefit assessments (commonly known as "user fees") such as those used to finance increased fire protection, flood control, sewage and other infrastructure, street lighting, and landscaping; and
   - Capital outlay spending from bond income, user fees, tidelands oil revenues, and federal subventions

Many localities initiated user fees to fund increased demands for public services after Proposition 13's passage made it more difficult to raise taxes. There is little analytical or practical justification for most of these fees to be outside of local appropriations limits because they function exactly like taxes in most instances. In addition, the establishment of special districts to levy assessments as a way around the Gann Limit has grown rapidly since the implementation of tax and appropriations limits in the late 1970s. The use of benefit assessments by localities has increased more than 500 percent since 1978, and the vast majority of agencies imposing these fees do not count them as taxes subject to the Gann Limit. The expansion of user fees and special district assessments appears to be a direct result of the imposition of the Gann Limit's restrictions on increases in more traditional types of taxes.

Regardless of the treatment of "non-tax" fees and assessments, a strong case can be made for continuing the exemption of capital outlay expenditures from an appropriations limit due to their complexity, purposes, and mostly one-time nature. Building state highways, a large metropolitan sewage system, or a major University entails the expenditure of additional billions of dollars in one or two years. Spending these sums of money would throw appropriations well ahead of virtually any spending limitation for this short period of time, and would be prohibitive to plan into an "appropriations limited" budget because they would necessitate a major reduction in expenditures for other services funded in that budget. Capital projects are an important part of maintaining the State, and neither in its development nor its implementation did the framers of Article XIIIB express intent to limit public funding for these projects.

The Postsecondary Education Commission has previously expressed concern about the availability of the recources necessary to finance the projected enrollment growth in postsecondary institutions during the next 20 years. Even before the passage of Proposition 98, it was clear that the Gann Limit would constrain the resources needed to sustain quality in postseconary education. The best available estimates of resource growth in California suggest that enrollments in postsecondary education will be growing at a slightly faster rate than the State's population and therefore at a faster rate than the growth in State appropriations permitted under the Gann Limit.

Recommendation: Commission staff should actively participate in legislative discussions designed to develop proposals to modify the existing Gann Limit on State appropriations.

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission *The Role of the State in Private Postsecondary Education: Recommendations for Change*. Commission Report 76-7. Sacramento: The Commission, July 1976.

--. *Public Policy, Accreditation, and State Approval in California: State Reliance on Non-Governmental Accrediting Agencies and on State Recognition of Postsecondary Institutions to Serve the Public Interest*. Commission Report 84-28. Sacramento: The Commission, July 1984.

--. *Meeting California's Adult Education Needs: Recommendation to the Legislature in Response to Sup-*

plemental Language in the 1987 Budget Act. Commission Report 88-35. Sacramento: The Commission, October 1988.

----. *Administrative Effectiveness of the Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) Program: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 610 (1985)*. In preparation.

Student Fee Policy Committee. *Principles for Long-Term Student Fee Policy: Report of the Fee Policy Committee Convened by the California Postsecondary Education Commission in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1984-85 Budget Act and Distributed for the Committee by the Commission*. Commission Report 84-40. Sacramento: The Commission, December 1984.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of early 1989, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero; *Vice Chair*
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto; *Chair*
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University

Borgny Baird, Long Beach; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Armen Sarafian, Pasadena; appointed by the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of the meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985; telephone (916) 445-7933.

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR THE COMMISSION, 1989

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 89-1

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

88-32 A Comprehensive Student Information System, by John G. Harrison: A Report Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by the Wyndgate Group, Ltd. (September 1988)

88-33 Appropriations in the 1988-89 State Budget for the Public Segments of Higher Education: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (September 1988)

88-34 Legislation Affecting Higher Education Enacted During the 1987-88 Session: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (October 1988)

88-35 Meeting California's Adult Education Needs: Recommendations to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1988 Budget Act (October 1988)

88-36 Implementing a Comprehensive Student Information System in California: A Recommended Plan of Action (October 1988)

88-37 Proposed Establishment of San Jose State University's Tri-County Center in Salinas: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request by the California State University for Funds to Create an Off-Campus Center to Serve Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties (October 1988)

88-38 Progress in Implementing the Recommendations of the Commission's 1987 Report on Strengthening Transfer and Articulation: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (October 1988)

88-39 Proposition 98 -- The Classroom Instruction Improvement and Accountability Act: A Staff Analysis for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (October 1988)

88-40 The Fourth Segment: Accredited Independent Postsecondary Education in California. The Fifth in a Series of Reports on the Financial Condition of California's Regionally Accredited Independent Colleges and Universities (December 1988)

88-41 Beyond Assessment: Enhancing the Learning and Development of California's Changing Student Population. A Report in Response to the Higher Education Talent Development Act of 1987 (Assembly Bill 2016; Chapter 1296, Statutes of 1987) (December 1988)

88-42 The Role of the Commission in Achieving Educational Equity: A Declaration of Policy (December 1988)

88-43 Education Needs of California Firms for Trade in Pacific Rim Markets: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (December 1988)

88-44 Progress on the Development of a Policy for Revenue Collected by the California State University Through Concurrent Enrollment: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language to the 1988-89 Budget Act (December 1988)

88-45 Prepaid College Tuition and Savings Bond Programs: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (December 1988)

89-1 Legislative Priorities for the Commission, 1989: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1989)

89-2 The Twentieth Campus: An Analysis of the California State University's Proposal to Establish a Full-Service Campus in the City of San Marcos in Northern San Diego County (January 1989)

89-3 Toward Educational Equity: Progress in Implementing the Goals of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83 of 1984: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 574, Statutes of 1987) (January 1989)

89-4 The Effectiveness of the Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) Program's Administrative and Policy-Making Processes: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 610 (1985) (January 1989)

89-5 Comments on the Community Colleges' Study of Students with Learning Disabilities: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Report Language to the 1988 State Budget Act (January 1989)

89-6 Prospects for Postsecondary Enrollment to 2005: Report of the Executive Director to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, January 23, 1989 (January 1989)